cc Sam Delaney ABC News

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
3/12/75

Mr. Jack Anderson
1612 K St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Anderson,

Day before yesterday - not for the first time - you had a column saying that Bobby Kennedy was really responsible for John's assassination. Yesterday you taped the same obscenity for ABC-TV, which aired it today.

Your appearance was as factually wrong as it is possible for a man to be. My purpose in this letter is to challenge you on what you represented as fact. Not all of it. Enough to remind you of what you did with the Eagleton matter and of what it did to the country.

On generalities, you said the FBI investigated the JFK assassination as though it were a vacuum cleaner. First, you have no way of knowing and no possible source not parti pris. Second, the available records of the Warren Commission refute this in countless instaces. Aside from this there is an abundance of contrary evidence readily available to one who has done what you have not, investigate. If you are willing to face the fact that you were apropagandist rather than a reporter I will take the time for providing more proofs than a reasonable man needs.

You said that JFK said he'd take the CIA apart because of the Bay of Pigs. Check your alleged source again.

You said there were only six attemtps against Castro (you have no way of knowing how many there may have been), that five were with Bobby in charge of the CIA, and that the last was about February 1963. Each of these alleged factual details is wrong. More attempts have been reported by reliable reporters, the last I recall at least two years later than February 1963.

I challenge you to provide proof that JFK put Bobby "in charge" of the CIA. Aside from this there is what you can't not know, that no one man can control all those countless employees in any agency. Then there is the quite separate question that plots to assassinate Castro or anyone else were presented to Bobby for his approval. When you say something like this in a representative society, where the people have to have knowledge on which to make their will known, you ought have something more substantiel that a hunch. What factual basis have you?

You said that Lee Harvey Oswald was "active" in the FPCC. Not even the FBI said that. Nor the Commission. They both said the opposite. There simply was no FPCC in NewOrleans. The literature Oswald handed out was printed locally and not by Oswald. The FBI lied to the Commission on t his in rewriting the field reports. Your office asked for my books. It got five which you apparently ignored. They are different than the others in that they cite the actual documents, where possible reproducing them in facsimile. If you want these documents, say the word. And if you want to hear my tapes of those the FBI interviewed and then lied about, be my guest. There just was no "Castro" activity for Oswald to be part of and he was not in any other way part of any. What he could have been doing is entirely opposite. (Nor was he, as your column said, a Communist. He was strongly anti=Communist, devoted to Orwell.)

What you have done is deceive millions at a time when for the first time there is the possibility of a real investigation the health of the federal spooks and the country both require. But these are your sources, aren't they? So, you have done what you can to exculpate the guilty, have

you not? Those guilty of the assassination all the evidence proves Oswald could not have committed. Those guilty of a coverup rather than an in vestigation.

I am willing to confront you and any and every source you may think you have on all you said was factual, none of which is or can be. On type, for it to be held against me if possible. And against you and yours if that be the case. I'll do it without preparation at any moment you select and I'll cite the proofs I will then give you.

You've said all these things. Are you man enough to defend yourself on them? With any and all the help you can get? Two of the most active Commission counsel are presently in Washington, Howard Willens and Wesley Liebeler. Others less active are also there, like Charles Shaffer and a number of others. All are lawyers. I am not. You have all these "impeccable" sources, Peter Jennings' puffery that is hardly straight newsreporting. Get them all together and let us see if where you referred to what you represented as their work they can make it even appear to be actuality. (I do not mention the overly-busy Coleman, whose smart-alecky letter on suspecting CIA I can give you.)

There remain many other questions of which I address merely these:

When for you this is all rehash, why do you rehash it now?

Why when the spooks are about to be investigated and have for the first time been subjected to some exposure?

Why to exactly coincide with the presentation of the opposite opinion - and that for the first time - by those who were in a position to know what they say, as you in no case are?

You are probably unaware of it but you have done exactly what one of your sources, Fiorini, was part of the moment JFK was killed. You have misdirected public and official attention and thinking at a crucial moment. Fiorini was not alone in this. That whole cabal launched an enormous effort. I can give you enough FBI reports to leave no reasonable doubt. One of them did the same thing when Bobby was killed. If my recollection is correct, your propaganda repeats his. I have it and you are welcome to it.

If you are willing to open your mind you could profit from reading a TOP SECRET transcript I publish in the fourth of my Whitewash series. Because giving you all the prior books was a total waste I did not give you this one. Read especially what Dulles said when he expected his words never to be seen. Particularly how they all lie and how the agents even frame each other. (He also found this right and proper.) With perjury the practise, can a reporter believe what perjurers tell him? And can a responsible journalist repeat these kinds of falsities without qualm? Can he and still be responsible?

I note also, whether or not there is a designed connection, that your propaganda coincides with the appearance that very morning of another propaganda book, one with considerable steam behind it. It also exculpates the CIA.

I do wish that those like you who have so much influence on what people can know and believe were a little less godlike in your self concepts and came a little closer in practise to the lofty principles to which you pretend dedication. Without it representative society can't work.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg